

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet(s) of drawings includes changes to Figure 1.

Attachment: Replacement sheet

REMARKS

Prior to entry of this paper, Claims 1-33 were pending. Claim 17 was objected to. Claims 1-33 were rejected. In this paper, Claims 1, 8, 10, 17, 22, 23, 28, and 31-33 are amended. No claims are canceled or added. Claims 1-33 are currently pending. No new matter is added by way of this amendment. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the presently pending claims is in condition for allowance.

Claim Objection

Claim 17 was objected to because of the following informalities: use of an improper tense of the word “comprise”. In response, Claim 17 has been amended to instead recite “comprises”, which is of the proper tense. Accordingly, Applicants’ representative respectfully requests the objection to Claim 17 be withdrawn.

Specification Objection

The amendment filed 4/01/08 was objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it allegedly introduces new matter into the disclosure. Applicants’ representative respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, without conceding to the merits this objection, and in order to expedite prosecution, independent Claim 1 has been amended to recite “determining whether client security software beyond other than a virtual sandbox is active on the client device”. As described in Applicants’ specification, the step of determining whether client security software is active occurs, in one embodiment, prior to use of the virtual sandbox (emphasis added). Specifically, block 306 of process 300 discusses a downloaded component analyzing configuration information about the client device, including what security features are active on the device.¹ Subsequently, block 314 of process 300 discusses a virtual sandbox, applied by a network device,² to restrict the client device from performing certain actions.³ Thus, there is support in Applicants’ specification as filed for determining whether client security software other than a virtual sandbox is active on the client

¹ See Applicant’s specification as originally filed, including at least on page 13, lines 15-20.

² See Applicant’s specification as originally filed, including at least on page 12, lines 12-16.

³ See Applicant’s specification as originally filed, including at least on page 14, lines 9-12.

device. Additional support for determining whether client security software other than a virtual sandbox can be found on Applicant's specification as filed, page 8 lines 10-15.

Drawing Objection

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for allegedly not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Applicants' representative respectfully disagrees, and instead submits that the drawings fully disclose the objected to items. Nevertheless, without conceding to the merits this objection, and in order to expedite prosecution, replacement drawing figures are attached that further conform the drawings to the specification. The specification as filed fully discloses a virtual sandbox (page 8 lines 15-16), kiosk (page 4 line 28), and hacker tool (page 13 line 23). Accordingly, Applicants' representative respectfully requests the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants' representative respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, without conceding to the merits this objection, and in order to expedite prosecution, independent Claim 1 has been amended to recite "determining whether client security software ~~beyond~~ other than a virtual sandbox is active on the client device". Support for this amendment can be found throughout Applicants' specification as filed, as discussed infra with regard to the objection to the specification (see page 18 of this paper). Accordingly, Applicants' representative respectfully requests the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 first paragraph of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-2, 8, 22-23, 25-27 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With respect to Claims 1, 22, 23 and 31, Applicants' representative respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, without conceding to the merits this objection, and in order to expedite prosecution, independent Claim 1 has been amended to recite "~~arranged to~~ that receives" and "~~that is arranged to~~ performs". Clearly, the limitations following "receives" and "performs" are limiting. Claims 22,

23, and 31 have been similarly amended. Accordingly, Applicants' representative respectfully requests the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph of amended Claims 1, 22, 23, and 31 be withdrawn.

With respect to Claims 2 and 25-27, Applicants' representative respectfully disagrees and instead submits that "if the client device is configured to not download the component", as recited for example in Claim 2, is definite and particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter which Applicants regard as their invention. First, a state of configuration is definite – either a client is configured to download the component, or it is not. Second, this state of configuration is clearly disclosed in Applicants' specification as filed on page 13 lines 5-6. Accordingly, Applicants' representative respectfully requests the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph of Claims 2 and 25-27 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claim 32 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 7,308,703 B2 (Wright et al.) (hereinafter "Wright"). Applicant's representative traverses this rejection.

Claim 32 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, "applying, with the server device, a restriction to the client device for access by the client device to the requested resource, the restriction based on the applied dynamic policy".⁴ In contrast, Wright discusses a mobile device that defines and enforces a communication session security policy on itself.⁵ A single device applying a security policy to itself is not the recited server device applying a restriction to the client device.

⁴ Support for this amendment can be found throughout the specification as filed, including for example, on page 14 lines 5-21.

⁵ See Wright, column 6 lines 1-6, column 6 lines 58-62, column 5 lines 60-67, column 15 lines 9-16, and column 16 lines 25-37.

Specifically, Wright discusses a policy setting module 212 and a policy enforcement control module 214, both included in the mobile device.⁶ Wright discusses modules 212 and 214 preventing files from being transferred to or from the mobile device,⁷ transferring encrypted versions of a file,⁸ or hiding a file from a requestor.⁹ In each of these scenarios, Wright's security modules secure the device in which they are contained – Wright does not discuss restrictions to a client device being applied by a server device. Therefore, Wright does not disclose, teach or even suggest “applying, with the server device, a restriction to the client device for access by the client device to the requested resource, the restriction based on the applied dynamic policy” as recited in amended Claim 32. Accordingly, Applicants' representative respectfully requests the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) of Claim 32 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 2, 4-11, 13-18 and 20-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright and further in view of US 7,430,524 B2 (Shah et al.) (hereinafter “Shah”). Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Wright and Shah as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of 7,200,272 B2 (Ishikawa) (hereinafter “Ishikawa”). Claims 3 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright and further in view of US 2002/0111852 A1 (Levine) (hereinafter “Levine”). Claim 33 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright and further in view of Levine. Applicant's representative traverses these rejections.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, “applying, with the apparatus, a restriction to the client device for access by the client device to the requested resource, the restriction based on the applied dynamic policy”.¹⁰ Amended independent Claim 1 is amended in a substantially similar, albeit different, way to amended Claim 32. Thus, Wright does not disclose, teach, or

⁶ See Wright, Figures 2, 7, and 8.

⁷ See Wright, column 7 lines 57-67.

⁸ See Wright, column 22 line 59 to column 23 line 1.

⁹ See Wright, column 23 lines 1-7.

¹⁰ Support for this amendment can be found throughout the specification as filed, including for example, on page 14 lines 5-21.

suggest the subject matter of amended Claim 1 for at least the same reasons as discussed above for amended Claim 32.

Shah also does not teach or suggest this limitation, or otherwise cure the deficiencies of Wright. In contrast, Shah discusses downloading a program to a client and determining information regarding a plurality of devices and programs on the client.¹¹ While Shah discusses using this information for documenting and modifying the client system configuration, as well as adding/removing programs or devices to/from the client system,¹² Shah does not teach or even suggest the recited apparatus applying a restriction to the client device. Therefore, even the proposed combination of Wright and Shah fails to teach or suggest “applying, with the apparatus, a restriction to the client device for access by the client device to the requested resource, the restriction based on the applied dynamic policy” as recited in amended Claim 1.

Independent Claims 10, 22, 28, 31, and 33 have been amended in a substantially similar, albeit different, way to amended Claim 1. Thus, the proposed combination of Wright and Shah fails to teach or suggest the subject matter of amended Claims 10, 22, 28, 31, and 33 for at least the same reasons as discussed above for amended Claim 1. Therefore, amended Claims 10, 22, 28, 31, and 33 are now in condition for allowance.

Furthermore, since dependent Claims 2-9, 11-21, 23-27, and 29-30 are at least allowable for the same reasons as amended independent Claims 1, 10, 22, and 28 upon which they depend respectively, the rejection of these claims is now moot. Accordingly, Applicants’ representative respectfully requests the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of Claims 1-31 and 33 be withdrawn.

¹¹ See Shah, column 76 lines 9-15.

¹² See Shah, column 77 lines 55-57.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that each of the presently pending claims (Claims 1-33) is in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is requested. Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's representative at the below-listed telephone number if it is believed that the prosecution of this application may be assisted thereby. Although only certain arguments regarding patentability are set forth herein, there may be other arguments and reasons why the claimed invention is patentable. Applicants reserve the right to raise these arguments in the future.

Dated: September 8, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By /David W. Foster/
David W. Foster
Registration No.: 60,902
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 770
Church Street Station
New York, New York 10008-0770
(206) 262-8925
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant

Attachments

Application No. 10/786,862
Amendment dated September 8, 2009
Reply to Office Action of May 6, 2009

Docket No.: 08204/0200873-US0/10.100

REPLACEMENT SHEET